



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/613,153

07/07/2003

Subhi K. Eldeiry

6739

7590
Dr. Subhi Eldeiry
15 Brook Street
Rensselaer, NY 12144-4255

04/10/2008

EXAMINER

GIBSON, RANDY W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2841

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that his claims are "method" claims, not a claim to equipment or design. The examiner agrees, but notes that the examiner never argued this point.

Applicant next argues that his method is a unique and non-obvious use of existing technology. The examiner does not see anything unique or non-obvious about the applicant's device, and the applicant did not state specifically what he thought was novel about his claimed device, either. Since the claims are not in proper legal format, it is impossible to tell from the claims themselves what legal protection, if any, applicant thinks that he is entitled to. Applicant should have at least pointed out what he thought made his device unique when compared to existing methods and/or systems. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Applicant seems to be arguing that he cannot provide an adequate description of his invention, because he does not have the capital needed to actually construct the invention. The examiner never asked for this. Applicant seems to have misunderstood the written description requirement, as well as what is meant by constructive reduction

to practice. Applicant needs to describe his invention in sufficient detail that one of ordinary skill in the technology area most closely related to the applicant's system could understand how to make and use it. This means that the applicant should at least understand the THEORY of what his method does, and he needs to explain that to other people in such detail that a technician COULD make the applicant's device simply using applicant's own description as a guide. Vague, abstract ideas are not patentable by themselves, unless applicant has figured out the details of how his method could work. If the applicant is simply connecting together conventional devices in a novel way, then the applicant should at least describe how these devices are connected.

Applicant seems to have has provided NO "detailed description" section in his application at all. All of his description seems to appear in the claims themselves, which is not appropriate. Applicant should look at the format of the other patents cited to get an idea of the proper format for a patent application.

To obtain a valid patent, a patent application must be filed that contains a full and clear disclosure of the invention in the manner prescribed by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The requirement for an adequate disclosure ensures that the public receives something in return for the exclusionary rights that are granted to the inventor by a patent. The grant of a patent helps to foster and enhance the development and disclosure of new ideas and the advancement of scientific knowledge. Upon the grant of a patent in the U.S., information contained in the patent becomes a part of the information available to the public for further research and development, subject only to the patentee's right to exclude others during the life of the patent.

In exchange for the patent rights granted, 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, sets forth the minimum requirements for the quality and quantity of information that must be contained in the patent to justify the grant. As discussed in more detail below, the patentee must disclose in the patent sufficient information to put the public in possession of the invention and to enable those skilled in the art to make and use the invention. The applicant must not conceal from the public the best way of practicing the invention that was known to the patentee at the time of filing the patent application. Failure to fully comply with the disclosure requirements could result in the denial of a patent, or in a holding of invalidity of an issued patent.

Any analysis of whether a particular claim is supported by the disclosure in an application requires a determination of whether that disclosure, when filed, contained sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention. The standard for determining whether the specification meets the enablement requirement was cast in the Supreme Court decision of *Mineral Separation v. Hyde*, 242 U.S. 261, 270 (1916) which postured the question: is the experimentation needed to practice the invention undue or unreasonable? That standard is still the one to be applied. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir.1988). Accordingly, even though the statute does not use the term “undue experimentation,” it has been interpreted to require that the claimed invention be enabled so that any person skilled in the art can make and use the invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See also *United States v. Telectronics, Inc.*, 857 F.2d 778, 785, 8

USPQ2d 1217, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (“The test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation.”). A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art.

Applicant argues he should not be required to submit new drawings because that no drawing could be made “that covered all possibilities”. This is not what the examiner asked for. Applicant could have at least provided some type of flow chart for his method.

Applicant also seems to argue that his application should not be rejected “..based on semantics or lack of resources or inability of the author to understand complex legal language...”. The examiner is afraid that the same laws and federal regulations apply evenly to everybody, and that only an act of Congress can grant a waiver of federal law in specific cases. The examiner lacks the authority to create exceptions in the legal requirements for one to obtain a patent.

If the applicant wishes to acquire a patent, the applicant is advised to look in the self help section of his bookstore or library for books on how to patent and license an invention, such as “Patent It Yourself”, or “Licensing Your Invention”. Also, the booklet “General Information Concerning Patents” for use by applicants contemplating the filing or prosecution of their own applications, >which was last published in 2001,< may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. An updated version of the booklet is available from the USPTO Web page at: <http://www.uspto.gov>

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: there is no “detailed description” of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The claims are extremely detailed as to what features that the applicant wishes to claim, but the sole drawing shows only a block diagram of a simple scale with only five elements. Each claim describes more than five elements. Therefore, all of the elements claimed must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New

Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The defects in the format of the claims are too numerous to mention. None of the claims are in a recognized legal format for claims, so the metes and bounds of what the applicant considers to be his invention cannot be determined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 2841

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ridling (US # 6,983,883). See the abstract, and Figure 1.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy W. Gibson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2103. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri., 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean A. Reichard can be reached on (571) 272-1984. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Randy W. Gibson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2841

Randy W. Gibson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2841